

American Opinion Summary

Department of State

Permanent file copy

No. 90

September 21, 1962

1. FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

Both strong editorial support, and some vigorous opposition, have greeted the appeals for increased aid funds by Pres. Kennedy and Sec. Rusk.

"Today Moscow is rejoicing," declares the New York Times comment on yesterday's House vote preserving the committee cuts. Drastic reduction in our aid "is not the way to persuade" other nations to be generous about sharing the burden, the Times adds.

This "biggest and most absurd cut of all" is denounced by the New York Herald Tribune (also Kansas City Times, Balt. Sun, Wash. Post). The Milwaukee Journal doesn't register "too much opposition to cuts in military aid," but says that in economic aid "we are in increasing competition with the Communist bloc." According to Edw. Morgan (ABC), U.S. Administrations have failed "properly to explain the philosophy of the program."

The Kennedy reforms in aid administration are stressed by the Providence Journal, citing "streamlined" organization, shift to loans, and increased emphasis on self-help and reforms by receiving countries (similarly, St. Louis Post-Dispatch).

On the other hand, "little disposition to effect basic reforms" has been found by the Wall St. Journal, which criticizes the promotion of "wrong things like socialism." A "healthy cut" in aid funds is favored by the Scripps-Howard papers which see "growing public skepticism over a program frequently found to be wasteful and sometimes scandal-ridden."

Disagreeing with the President's charge of legislative "irresponsibility," the Washington Star says Chairman Passman's subcommittee did a "creditable" job. "By any reasonable standard," says the Chicago Tribune, the committee was "generous to a fault."

2. CUBA

The Senate's approval of the joint resolution on Cuba wins strong approval in initial comment. "The Congress is accurately reflecting the sentiment of the Nation in stating its readiness" to support Presidential moves if necessary "to eliminate the hazard" in the Caribbean, declares the Philadelphia Inquirer. The Washington Post finds the resolution "a sober and careful statement" which neither Moscow nor Havana should lightly dismiss (similarly, Wash. Sta.).

Public Opinion Studies Staff • Bureau of Public Affairs

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 2 -

CUBA
(Contd.)

"Fortunately, the Senate and the House are wiser than the extremists among them," says the New York Times in saluting the resolution as "strong in its language but restrained in its effect." To the New York Herald Tribune, the resolution, far from being an interference with Presidential prerogatives, "is the best possible support for the Executive in a period when American will and national purpose may be a decisive factor."

A few are less satisfied with the resolution. Arthur Krock, for one, reiterates his disappointment that the Senate remains "strangely determined to pretend" that it has not conceded some blunting of the original thrust of the Monroe Doctrine--even though "there are sound reasons" for the modification (in N.Y. Times; somewhat similarly, Sevellon Brown in Providence Journal). But David Lawrence strongly protests that the resolution "publicizes a concession to Russia" by pledging "only to prevent further extension" of Communist operations in Latin America while "virtually accepting" the Soviet presence in Cuba. Scripps-Howard's Washington News suggests that Secretary Rusk's recent testimony before Senate committees, which constitutes "the most specific statements the Administration has made on its plans," may do "more than vaguely worded resolutions of Congress to convince the Kremlin" of U.S. resoluteness.

Administration Cuban policy has continued to hold the support of a wide range of observers. "The overwhelming weight of evidence sustains the President's belief that it is Castro and his supporters who are in trouble now, not we," declares the Boston Herald, adding: "We have everything to gain by waiting. The action-at-any-price people are doing the country a disservice" (also, Minneapolis Star, Milwaukee Journal, Christian Science Monitor, Balt. Sun, Chicago News, James Wechsler of N.Y. Post, Mrs. Roosevelt, The Nation).

Cuba is but "one part of a very difficult world strategy," the Kansas City Star stresses, and "it would be highly dangerous if the excitement over Cuba caused us to forget the dangers that confront us in the rest of the world." Milburn P. Akers believes the President is "eminently correct in proceeding cautiously in the current crisis provided caution isn't a synonym for lack of ultimate action" (in Chicago Sun-Times).

But a number protest that U.S. Cuban policy "is wrapped in what appears to be indecision" (Life; similarly, N.Y. Mirror, Cincinnati Enq., Wm. S. White, Henry J. Taylor). The President is handling Cuba "up to now like a victim of appeasement-minded advisers," charges the New York News. Why do we maintain our military power? the Los Angeles Times asks. "As something to sit on while the Soviets create a strategic satellite at our door?" Chester Bowles' criticism of "hot-headed extremists" draws attention from a few critics (e.g. Hearst's N.Y. Journal-American, Wall St. Journal).

OFFICIAL USE ONLY